



## **AMPS Joint Board Meeting**

**September 21, 2015**

**6:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

**First Presbyterian Church – 1820 15th Street, Oerter Hall**

# **Meeting Notes**

### **QUESTIONS FOR BOARD MEMBER DISCUSSION**

#### **On-Street Car Share Policy**

1. Should Boulder's Car Share Policy allow for designation of on-street, public right-of-way parking spaces for car sharing companies to use?
2. Should Boulder's Car Share Policy allow for the GPS model car share vehicles to park in any space (including metered spaces and NPP parking zone spaces) in excess of the time restrictions present in such areas?

#### **Parking Code**

3. The Fox Tuttle Hernandez parking data shows that current parking requirements generally require more parking city wide than is needed for land uses. Which scenario for parking code changes would be advised moving forward?
4. If either Scenario 2 or 3 is chosen, should the new parking requirements automatically link to new TDM requirements as part of redevelopment or development projects if a lower range of parking is proposed?

#### **TDM**

5. How do board members envision the relationship between the parking code changes, a TDM Plan ordinance and the impact fee study?
6. What are the pros and cons related to the two approaches for a TDM Plan ordinance for new developments?
7. Should staff include in the city-wide approach an option to have the trigger based on the number of employees or bedrooms/housing units?

#### **General comments:**

- There needs to be clear "bullet-proof" rationale to justify changes to the code.
- Changes should be consistent with the TMP – with descriptions as to how.
- Data should show snapshots in five year increments up to now to show trends.
- Do not repeat the failings of the Folsom "Right-sizing" project in terms of outreach and data.
- There has been recent pushback from the community on a variety of fronts; consider this when planning and acting.

**Car share – Themes and comments:**

- *Age limitation*
  - There shouldn't be an age limitation;
    - Do car share companies have age minimums? (can we get CU usage stats of eGo cars?)
- *Last mile*
  - Car share is a good last mile approach;
  - First AND last mile programs are important.
- *Let the market sort it out/give it a try*
  - We don't need to be so cautious or restrictive and rather should use a hands off approach to encourage people to use car share . . . then we will get a better idea of its utility;
  - Let the market sort out the best car share model(s);
  - Need to make people comfortable with the options and let's just see what happens;
  - Do we want to incentivize car share in some way?
- *NPP*
  - Exempting car share cars in NPPs and from parking rules makes sense to encourage use:
    - Car share is already new to many and we should not add additional worries;
  - If student population uses car share that could free up some NPP spaces;
  - Exempting car share vehicles in NPPs from hour requirements could have a positive influence on reducing SOV trips.
- *Metrics*
  - Density/use might be better metric than length of time for tracking car share parking use;
  - Whether to provide parking for car share should be tied to the total number of spaces provided/tied to data about how car share impacts parking.
- *Fairness/Equity*
  - Support for enabling all car share models/companies, it's a low cost to city/areas, limit contracts to a year, worth trying;
  - Fairness to all models and companies is important.
- *Allocating spots*
  - Should there be designated spots for point-to-point car share? Should spots be on-street?
  - Support for charging something if giving car share a spot, they should still have to pay something as other users must pay;
  - Should parking spots be generically allocated to all car share companies or dedicated by company?
  - Before we dive into this idea, we should know where the allotted parking spaces will be so that we can gauge effectiveness;
  - Could there be flexibility with providing generic car share spaces, rather than dedicated by company?
    - How would this actually function? Do we have examples from other cities?
  - Should there be peak time pricing for car share spots?
  - Should there be time limits for on-street parking, perhaps varied for metered vs. neighborhoods?
  - In high use areas and at high use times, would be nice to incentivize car share companies for parking space turnover;

- Consider off-street city-owned (lots and garages).
- *Measuring benefit(s)*
  - Would having car share really free up parking? How can we know?
    - Anecdotal one car share car frees up four parking spots; board member sees this for employees using car share and pool cars for on-call client needs, anywhere from 1:2 to 1: 6 share space.
  - Also enables car-light or car-free for some people/households;
  - Need to demonstrate benefits;
  - Should require car share companies to share their data with us;
  - Important not to cluster benefits or impacts in just one area (use a managed approach);
  - Spots on the street provide advertising through visibility of car and logo – this is another benefit to the companies.
- *Measuring costs*
  - What is the administrative burden of providing car share parking?
  - How much car share off-street/on-street parking is too much?
  - Providing car share parking eliminates those spaces for other users;
  - Not clear if benefit is enough to outweigh any negative impact especially in high demand areas.
- *Partnership opportunities*
  - Identify partners (i.e. county) who might have parking availability and need (off-street);
  - Is there an opportunity to partner with private property owners, including private garages?
- *Transit*
  - City should ID locations with the highest benefit, e.g. on transit corridors, near businesses;
  - Car sharing works better with transit, paid parking;
  - Could a GPS model locate a parking space close to final transit stops?
  - Where should car share parking spaces be?
    - Close to transit hubs?
  - Good to identify co-benefits, i.e. is car share parking near transit hub, is there a connection to other access points:
    - Concern - are we limited by our current transit system?
- *TDM*
  - Could add a car share space requirement with TDM.
- *Outreach/communication*
  - Important to communicate with and message to downtown about car share opening up more access, freeing spaces.

### **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Themes and comments:**

- *District vs. Citywide Approach*
  - Like the district approach /using aggregate instead of enforcing on individual properties;
  - Like idea of district but need more info about pros and cons;

- Like idea of managing by district and Scenario III (progressive for parking code changes) if exclude districts that already have parking pressures, including CAGID, UGID, etc.;
- An individual developer can't implement TDM as well as a district or the city;
- Citywide would be simpler, but would need to be possible to tailor;
- How do you address weak link(s) in TDM in a district?
  - Education/additional funding for district?
- District approach vs. city wide:
  - Hybrid approaches – avoid bureaucracy, but do need TDM with teeth.
- District approach seems good; effective way to promote TDM:
  - Can accommodate existing uses,
  - Impact fees could cover TDM costs and projects,
  - Like progressive scenario III,
  - May have unintended consequences such as businesses moving out, spillover effects,
  - Provide options for hybrid parking, remote lots, satellite parking.
- *Parking Minimums and Maximums*
  - A lot of places parking requirements still dictate what developers can and do build;
  - Could have surface parking maximum(s) but allow unlimited private parking underground if people want to pay to build it;
  - Could reasonably reduce or eliminate parking minimums everywhere outside districts where parking is in high demand (not in commercial districts, NPPs etc.).
- *Political Will*
  - Is there political will to do this? To do all things at once? Community/stakeholders too fatigued?
    - What are the priorities if we can't do it all?
- *Enforcement*
  - How? Monitor or not?
  - It's most difficult to enforce code and TDM for land owners after initial implementation.
- *Link TDM and Parking Codes*
  - There should be cooperation between TDM and parking requirements, must be tied;
- *Trigger for TDM*
  - How would TDM be triggered, if not by district?
    - Number of employees?
    - Number of units?
    - Number of SOV trips?
    - Degree of parking utilization?
  - First impression is that motor vehicle trips is the right trigger for TDM:
    - Should be outcome-based.
- *Transit*
  - Fort Collins has taken a leadership role with BRT, we should do that here. Don't wait for RTD!
  - Behavior is hard to change; even with transit options many will still choose to drive and accept the delay;
  - Large companies could provide alternative shuttle bus service for their employees.

- *Desire for more info/details*
  - Would like to see specifics of TDM rather than funds going into capital infrastructure “black hole”;
  - Need more info – work on presentation for boards.
- *Program design*
  - Needs to be straightforward.
- *Burden/Cost*
  - One member was opposed to putting burden on employers/businesses. Rather it should be on the property owner . . . more constant. Longest term vision.
  - Developers could buy into a system; city creates the infrastructure, needs to be a partnership.

#### **Parking code changes – Themes and comments:**

- *Link to TDM*
  - Parking code changes should be linked to TDM;
  - Like the idea of linking to TDM;
  - Combine II/moderate scenario with TDM;
  - Would be helpful to have TDM piece codified and that could generate performance-based metrics;
  - Gradually implement TDM requirements for parking reductions:
    - Avoid abrupt changes that lead to strong reactions to suddenness of change.
- *Big picture*
  - Being aggressive on parking may be challenging, but the approach would be similar to the city’s open space policies of the 1970s which are well supported now;
  - What are the problems we are solving? If we move forward on these changes where will we be a year from now?
  - Tremendously wasteful to have excess unused parking, for both the city and the people;
  - Is the price right for downtown parking garages?
    - No, because demand still exceeds supply, price is too low
    - But if priced higher, parking is a privilege of the rich, prices out the middle class.
  - Would be helpful to have data from district(s) that are working.
- *NPPs*
  - City could proactively create NPPs with consent and cooperation of neighbors.
- *Parking maximums and minimums*
  - Implement realistic minimum and maximum requirements – lessens fear;
  - Avoid parking maximums or have maximums based on visual impacts:
    - Parking has visual impacts; allow underground or well-screened parking if developer wants to pay for and provide it.
- *Access to alternative modes*
  - To make a reduction in SOV trips/cars successful, need heavy dependence on transit, mode availability:

- Outside of commercial districts and some older neighborhoods, walking environment is just not there.
- Need choices before going to drastic change/demonstrate or show why next level is needed.
- *Scenario 2*
  - I is too “suburban; III feels like too much/too progressive; like moderate II option;
  - Is there an “Option II Lite” – a phased approach or transition as transit improves? A “performance-based approach”?
  - Moderate (II) changes to parking code most likely to succeed – community not ready for progressive approach (III).
- *Scenario 3*
  - Strong support for progressive option III, but would like:
    - More data,
    - More quantification,
    - A timeline,
    - Define what we are trying to accomplish.
  - What are the potential ripple effects of scenario III?
    - Behavior changes takes time,
    - Look to Folsom right-sizing backlash.
  - Most people at one table supported the Progressive (III) approach, but one person was emphatic that more data and numbers would be necessary to convince them of the wisdom of the progressive approach.

### **Board and Commission members in attendance:**

*Table 1 – Staff: Chris Hagelin and Jay Sugnet*

Tim Hillman – EAB

Aaron Brockett – PB

John Koval – BJAD

Jyotsna Raj – UCHAMC

*Table 2 – Staff: Molly Winter and Taylor Jacobs*

Alex Hyde-Wright – BJAD

Leonard May – PB

Andria Bilich – TAB

Karen Crofton – EAB

*Table 3 – Staff: Kathleen Bracke and Lisa Smith*

Eli Feldman – DMC

Bryan Bowen – PB

Zane Selvans – TAB

Thomas Wells – BJAD

*Table 4 – Staff: Karl Guiler and Lane Landrith*

Bill Rigler – TAB

John Gerstle – PB

Dakota Soifer – UCHAMC

*Table 5 – Staff: Bill Cower and Vanessa Solesbee*

Daniel Stellar – TAB

Elizabeth Payton – PB

Jerry Shapins – DMC

**Email comments from Crystal Gray (PAB):**

**From:** Crystal Gray [<mailto:graycrystal@comcast.net>]

**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2015 10:03 AM

**To:** Sugnet, Jay

**Cc:** boulderplanningboard; Spence, Cindy

**Subject:** Re: DATE IS CONFIRMED: AMPS Joint Board Meeting is CONFIRMED for 9/21

**Importance:** High

Some thoughts on tonight's AMPS Joint Board Meeting.

**First some random comments:**

New Community Bus System. Community Eco-passes continue to be on the AMPS program, which is good, but we should talk about expansion of the HOP, SKIP etc. system (or something new) if RTD is not going to provide service that will make bus service more convenient for Boulder residents and workers. How about letting a non-profit, or private, bus system run in Boulder, with a city subsidy and subsidy from developments wanting a parking reduction, - it could expand bus service without being beholden to RTD. An 'unbundling' of sorts and free if the city foots the bill.

Feeling safe outside of a car. We need to pay attention to making sure people feel safe walking, biking and getting to and waiting for buses. This applies to commuters and residents. Too many intersections around downtown, and other commercial areas, feel unsafe with distracted drivers (yep, texting and talking on cell phones) and this encourages people to use their cars. Just ask people if there are barriers to them walking/biking to their nearby services, groceries and work. We might be surprised in what we hear. I did notice the AMPS prioritization matrix has a lot of excellent work programs but didn't see this.

Letting residents rent their on-site parking. The underground 'sharing parking economy' has been in practice for years around the downtown by 'unbundling' parking on residential properties and renting private spaces to downtown workers during the day. Should we look at the pros (increases supply) and cons (increases traffic and can lead to paving backyards) and decide if this should be legal?

Parking Related Code changes - Reductions - I did not see anything specifically addressing reductions for ADU's and OAU parking. We should look at that in case the council, finally, gets around to looking at ADU's (the easiest of the two to implement). Who wants to pave their garden when they are not increasing the allowed occupancy of a lot and in some cases not even increasing the sq. ft of a house. Should we also give parking reductions for land marking of properties to avoid preserving a significant structure only to have the yard/garden paved over?

**Agenda Item comments:****TDM Toolkit for private development.**

With almost all site reviews, outside of Boulder Junction and the CAGID areas, applicants request a parking reduction yet they have a TDM plan that only provides Eco-Passes for three years - we all know this is a problem. With the much needed revision of the TDM Toolkit can we also be provided with a timeline for the implementation of a revised TDM that can be used in Site Review? I do support the proposed measuring of TDM strategies etc. but this has been going on for years and Planning Board is approving project after project with weak TDM's because we cannot ask for more effective TDM's. I know that PB members know this but other boards might not.

**Parking pricing: parking fines and NPP permit pricing.**

One of the big issue for downtown NPP zones, besides NPP enforcement (which can raise more revenue), has been the over issuing of commuter permits that has led to the neighborhoods being over

parked leaving little room for residents, as well as short term parkers, to find spaces not only on their blocks but even within several blocks of their residences. The NPP was initially designed with the agreement to have commuter permits issued if there was 20% 'white space', vacant space, on each block where residents and short term parkers (2-3 hours) can come and go. This was to avoid turning the neighborhoods into parking lots for office/retail workers. This policy has worked well for years but lately there has been demand, by downtown workers looking for lower parking fees, to issue more permits. Some blocks have actually had 4 commuter permits issued on each side of the block. If we have a lax policy on issuing commuter permits are we really achieving a modal shift? As one neighbor said at a meeting with the city manager, "with all the current office space building downtown you have a parking tsunami coming". We really need to get on top of this and provide a way for downtown workers to get to work besides in their cars and to understand what the barriers are to using their Eco-passes, biking or walking. Obviously I could go on all day on this topic!

Scoping criteria for the formation of new parking districts.

When PB is reviewing projects we often hear from nearby residents saying they are concerned about overflow parking into their neighborhood. The Steel Yards residents recently made this comment during the review of The Commons (an office building just north of the Depot in Boulder Junction). The reply to residents is always the same - we have an NPP program. I would suggest that we all understand exactly what is involved in analyzing requests for a new NPP district, how long does it take to get implemented and what tools a neighborhood has to tailor it to specific needs in their area. The packet materials suggest, under the AMPS Matrix, that we should look at streamlining the process which I support. If a parking reduction is requested, as part of a site review, it would be helpful to understand how the applicant might participate in the analysis of 'before parking conditions' in a nearby neighborhood.